



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

should, however, be required, as soon as possible, to consult the dictionary for the meaning of a word. In so doing he will not merely exercise his faculty of discrimination in selecting, from among those nearly synonymous, the correct meaning demanded by the context; but he will unconsciously at the same time widen his vocabulary and his knowledge of the capabilities of the language. A special vocabulary is apt to make the work of translating wholly mechanical; and not only that, but it tends to make a word recognizable from the context alone—to make it the member of a phrase, and not a real entity which may be used apart and in other combinations. It is not to be inferred from this that single words are never to be glossed. If a word is used in the text that is not to be found in the dictionaries ordinarily accessible, then it is the special province of the notes fully to explain its meaning. The same is true of a word coined by an author to suit a special need, or of a word used for the occasion in a certain specific sense different from the ordinary.

Usually, in the selection of a text for translation, not enough stress is laid upon this matter of notes. If it is objected that French and German Texts with well made notes are not always at hand, it is easy to refer to the familiar law of supply and demand which will operate here as well as elsewhere—if little is required, little will be furnished. At certain stages in teaching a foreign language the fitness or unfitness of the notes should determine, to no small degree, the advisability of adopting or of refusing to adopt a text into school or college. It is not forgotten in making this statement that the teacher is supposed to be a live commentary, not only upon the text itself, but upon everything connected with it. Still, direct advantages may be gained and no end of time saved, and very profitably saved, by taking advantage of the information ready at hand in notes carefully compiled by some one who has made a special study of the author and his work—and only a person with these qualifications is capable of performing successfully the difficult task of editing a foreign text.

WM. H. CARPENTER.

Columbia College.

THE ANGLICIZATION OF MACAULAY'S VOCABULARY.

In his charming biography of Macaulay, Trevelyan discloses many interesting facts regarding his uncle's literary methods and standards. Among other things, it is made clear that Macaulay himself believed that the style of his later writings was greatly superior to that of his earlier contributions to the *Edinburgh Review*. Writing to Napier in 1847, Macaulay says: "My collected reviews have succeeded well. . . . There are few of them which I read with satisfaction. These few, however, are generally the latest, and this is a consolatory circumstance. The most hostile critic must admit, I think, that I have improved greatly as a writer. The third volume seems to me worth two of the second, and the second worth ten of the first."

In chap. XIV of the Biography, Trevelyan writes thus: "During the later years of his life, Macaulay sent an occasional article to the 'Encyclopædia Britannica'. . . . The articles in question are those on Atterbury, Bunyan, Goldsmith, Doctor Johnson, and William Pitt. . . . Compact in form, crisp and nervous in style, these five little essays are everything which an article in an encyclopædia should be. . . . Macaulay's belief about himself as a writer was that he improved to the last; and this question of the superiority of his later over his earlier manner may securely be staked upon a comparison between the article on Johnson in the *Edinburgh Review*, and the article on Johnson in the 'Encyclopædia Britannica.' The latter of the two is, indeed, a model of that which its eminent subject pronounced to be the essential qualification of a biographer."

It is certainly significant that the improvement in Macaulay's style was coincident with the substitution of English words for those of foreign derivation. The second article on Johnson was published in 1856. By this time Macaulay must have looked back upon the sonorous Latinized diction of 1831 as labored puerility.

The following calculations will exhibit the nature and extent of the change which had taken place between 1828, when the Essay on History was contributed to the *Edinburgh*,

and the date when he composed the second article on Johnson. The classes of words excluded from the computation are the six categories designated in the paper on De Quincey, in the February number of MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES. The number of words examined is 5,000 from each essay.

ESSAY ON HISTORY.

A—PROXIMATE DERIVATION.

	No. of Words.	Percentage.
French.....	2,599	51.98
Germanic.....	1,566	31.32
Latin.....	774	15.48
Greek.....	38	.76
Celtic.....	16	.32
Romance Languages exclusive of French....	7	.14

B—ULTIMATE DERIVATION.

	No. of Words.	Percentage.
Latin.....	2,939	58.78
Germanic.....	1,606	32.12
Greek.....	400	8.00
Celtic.....	26	.52
All Romance Languages...	20	.40
Slavonic.....	4	.08
Oriental.....	4	.08
West Indian.....	1	.02

ARTICLE ON JOHNSON.

A—PROXIMATE DERIVATION.

	No. of Words.	Percentage.
French.....	2,177	43.54
Germanic.....	2,099	41.98
Latin.....	630	12.60
Celtic.....	41	.82
Greek.....	31	.62
Romance Languages exclusive of French....	11	.22
Oriental.....	11	.22

B—ULTIMATE DERIVATION.

	No. of Words.	Percentage.
Latin.....	2,489	49.78
Germanic.....	2,128	42.56
Greek.....	259	5.18
Celtic.....	54	1.08
All Romance Languages...	32	.64
Oriental.....	31	.62
Slavonic.....	7	.14

In the former essay, Macaulay employed 1,491 words of Old English origin; in the latter, 1,949,—a gain of 9.16 per cent. This corresponds nearly to the difference between the Germanic (ultimate) of the earlier and that of the later period (10.44 per cent), the other factors remaining substantially unchanged, with the exception of Scandinavian, which shows a gain of 1.28 per cent. Latin (ultimate) recedes in nearly the same ratio as Germanic encroaches, the loss being 9.00 per cent, French (proximate) corresponding very closely, with a loss of 8.44 per cent.

Referring to the paper on De Quincey, it will be seen that he uses 41.13 per cent of native English words; in the Essay on History, Macaulay uses 29.82 per cent, and in that on Samuel Johnson, 38.98 per cent. De Quincey is therefore more Anglican than Macaulay at his best, a conclusion quite borne out by the percentages of De Mille, which are 82 and 76 respectively.

ALBERT S. COOK.

University of California.

THE OATHS OF STRASBURG.

L. CLÉDAT (*Revue des Langues Rom.* Oct. 1885, pp. 309-10) proposes to read *et in aiudha [li] er in cadhuna cosa* "et je lui serai en aide en chaque chose" instead of *& in aiudha & in cadhuna cosa* "et en aide et en chaque chose" changing thus *&* into *er* (Lat. *ero*) and adding *li*. I cannot approve of this emendation for two reasons especially:

1. The passage would now read thus: *si salvarai eo cist meon fradre Karlo, et in aiudha er in cadhuna cosa, sicum per dreit son fradra salvar dist.* Thus the first clause "*si salvarai eo c. m. fradre K.*" is separated from its complement "*si cum p. d. son fradra salvar dist*" by a whole clause, which introduces a new idea and which has no similar complement. Such a construction would hardly be accepted if it were the reading of the unique manuscript. I prefer therefore to regard, according to the manuscript reading, *si salvarai cadhuna cosa* as one sentence and *et in aiudha et in cadhuna cosa* as an adverbial attribute to *salvarai eo*.

2. The German text confirms the reading of the manuscript and this is of some weight as the German Oaths follow closely the French